REMARKS

The objections set forth in paragraphs 1-10 have been corrected as required.

Claim 1, for example, calls for a two-stage filtering process. The first and second stages are different. That is because the first stage filters to collect content categories from content and the second stage filters, from those categories, content of interest. Thus, the first stage has the result that categories are selected and the second stage has the result that content within categories is selected.

In the cited reference, each filtering is "very similar." See column 14, lines 24-28. That is, there is never any category filtering and then filtering within categories. Instead, information of interest to communities is filtered and information of interest to individuals is filtered. But there is never any filtering of categories of interest and then filtering within those categories. The only difference is that in the member client level, filtering is only for the individual users and in the community level, the empirical data for all users who subscribe to the community is used. Thus, you simply select that content that everybody likes and that content that individuals like. You never select categories and then select from within the categories.

Therefore, a *prima facie* rejection is not made out and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

On the same basis, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 16 is respectfully requested.

Date: <u>December 11, 2009</u>

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]
Attorneys for Intel Corporation